

**REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review of this application and the finding of allowable subject matter. Please cancel claims 1, 6-10, and 15-20 without prejudice. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. Claims 2-5, and 11-14 are pending in this application.

**Claim Amendments**

Claims 1-20 were previously pending.

Amended claims: 2-5, 11-14.

Canceled claims: 1, 6-10, 15-20.

No new claims are added.

Pending claims: 2-5, 11-14.

### **Rejection of the Claims**

#### **35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter set forth therein. In rewriting pending claims 2-5, and 11-14 (which would be allowable if rewritten to incorporate their base claims and any intervening claims and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph), Applicant has omitted incorporation of the element pointed out by the Examiner as being indefinite: “approximates/emulates a shape of a thumb and a forefinger of a human hand in a trigger-pulling position.” Although Applicant disagrees with the rejection, since human hands have a universal similarity of proportion between relative parts despite the relative size of a given hand, the point is moot because the language in question has been deleted from the pending claims.

Applicant respectfully suggests that since the language singled out by the Examiner as being indefinite has been removed from the pending claims, the pending claims overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection and are now allowable.

#### **35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 6-10, and 15-20 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a). Applicant requests, however, that claims 1, 6-10, and 15-20 be canceled without prejudice.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's finding of allowable subject matter.

Claim 2 has been rewritten to incorporate the limitations of base claim 1, minus the element "approximates a shape of a thumb and a forefinger of a human hand in a trigger-pulling position," which the Examiner found indefinite. Therefore, claim 2 should be allowable.

Claim 3 has been rewritten to incorporate the limitations of base claim 1, minus the element "approximates a shape of a thumb and a forefinger of a human hand in a trigger-pulling position," which the Examiner found indefinite. Therefore, claim 3 should be allowable.

Claim 4 has been rewritten to incorporate the limitations of base claim 1, minus the element "approximates a shape of a thumb and a forefinger of a human hand in a trigger-pulling position," which the Examiner found indefinite. Therefore, claim 4 should be allowable.

Claim 5 has been rewritten to incorporate the limitations of base claim 1 and intervening claim 4, minus the element in claim 1 "approximates a shape of a thumb and a forefinger of a human hand in a trigger-pulling position," which the Examiner found indefinite. Therefore, claim 5 should be allowable.

Claim 11 has been rewritten to incorporate the limitations of base claim 10, minus the element "approximates a shape of a thumb and a forefinger of a human hand in a trigger-pulling position," which the Examiner found indefinite. Therefore, claim 11 should be allowable.

Claim 12 has been rewritten to incorporate the limitations of base claim 10, minus the element "approximates a shape of a thumb and a forefinger of a human

hand in a trigger-pulling position,” which the Examiner found indefinite. Therefore, claim 12 should be allowable.

Claim 13 has been rewritten to incorporate the limitations of base claim 10, minus the element “approximates a shape of a thumb and a forefinger of a human hand in a trigger-pulling position,” which the Examiner found indefinite. Therefore, claim 13 should be allowable.

Claim 14 has been rewritten to incorporate the limitations of base claim 10 and intervening claim 13, minus the element in claim 10 “approximates a shape of a thumb and a forefinger of a human hand in a trigger-pulling position,” which the Examiner found indefinite. Therefore, claim 14 should be allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully suggests that claims 2-5, and 11-14 are in condition for allowance and requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 8-17-04

By: Mark C. Farrell  
Lee & Hayes PLLC  
Mark C. Farrell  
Reg. No. 45,988  
(509) 324-9256